UNITED	STATE	S DISTI	RICT	COURT
DISTRI	CT OF	MASSA	CHU	SETTS

		Ü		D 011	FIC	E
7 65	,	: M	27	೦	:	35

DISTRICT OF MASSACHOSETTS	78.W27 P 1:35
x	A TEMPLET COURT
LUTHER McBRIDE,	1'01 N1:3 1 NMG
Plaintill,	11111
v.	AMMOUNTS 350.00
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	DOCAL RULE 4:1
Defendant.	WANVERFORM / MICH ISSUED BY DATE 9/1/2005
Plaintiff, LUTHER MCBRIDE, by his attorney, STEPHEN L.	

Plaintiff, LUTHER MCBRIDE, by his attorney, STEPHEN L. RAYMOND, ESQ., as and for his Complaint against the defendant, AETNA LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY (hereinafter, "AETNA"), alleges as follows:

MAGISTRATE JUDGE ROC

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 1. Jurisdiction of the court is based upon 29 U.S.C. §§1132(e)(1) and 1132(f) which give the district courts jurisdiction to hear civil actions brought to recover benefits due under the terms of an employee benefit plan, which for purposes of the instant case, grants to participants Long Term Disability ("LTD") Insurance benefits. AETNA insures the benefits provided through Plaintiff's employer's LTD Plan. In addition, this action may be brought before this court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1331, which gives the district court jurisdiction over actions that arise under the laws of the United States.
- 2. The LTD Plan contains provisions for administrative or internal appeal of a denial of benefits. Plaintiff has exhausted his remedies under these provisions, has received a final denial of his claim and, therefore, this matter is properly before this court for <u>de novo</u> review under *Firestone Tire & Rubber Co. v. Bruch*, 489 U.S. 101 (1989).

- 3. Plaintiff, Luther McBride, is a resident of Riverview, Florida.
- 4. Venue is proper in this district pursuant to 29 U.S.C. § 1132(e)(2) which allows an action under Title I of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974, as amended ("ERISA") to be brought in the district where the plan is administered, where the breach took place, or where a defendant resides or may be found. The Plan was administered and the breach took place within this district.

NATURE OF ACTION

5. Plaintiff's claim seeks a declaration that Plaintiff is entitled to disability income benefits pursuant to an employee benefit plan providing for long term disability benefits, sponsored and administered by Plaintiff's employer, Aramark Corporation, and insured by Defendant, AETNA, under Plan No. 700141-16-002. As Plaintiff's claim arises under an employee benefit plan, established and maintained by an employer for the benefit of its employees, the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 ("ERISA")(29 U.S.C. §1001 et seq.) applies to this action. Said benefits were effective at all times relevant hereto.

THE PARTIES

- 6. Plaintiff, Mr. McBride, is a 55 year-old man who was born on April 8, 1950.
- 7. Aramark Corporation's Long Term Disability Plan, is an Employee Benefit Plan as defined by ERISA.
- 8. Defendant, AETNA, is a business entity, on information and belief, authorized to conduct the business of insurance within the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. AETNA is the insurer of LTD benefits under the terms of an "employee benefit plan" (the "Plan") as defined by ERISA. AETNA is a fiduciary with respect to claims under the terms of the Plan. AETNA maintains offices at 151 Farmington Avenue, Hartford, CT, 06156.

STATEMENT OF FACTS

- 9. Prior to, and including August 2, 1999, Plaintiff was employed by Aramark Corporation as a chef.
- 10. For a period up to and including August 2, 1999, Plaintiff, together with other active full time employees, was covered as a participant under the Aramark Corporation's Long Term Disability Plan sponsored, funded, and administered by Plaintiff's employer and insured by defendant, AETNA. The Plan provides for payment of monthly income benefits to participants who become Totally Disabled. Payments under the Plan begin, after a 180-day waiting period. The monthly benefit is determined based on a set percentage of pre-disability monthly earnings which may be reduced by income from specified other sources as these terms are identified in the Plan. The other sources include Social Security Insurance benefits.
 - 11. The LTD Plan defines "Disability" as follows:

You will be deemed to be disabled while either of the following applies to you: In the first 30 months of a certified period of disability:

You are not able, solely because of disease or injury, to perform the material duties of your own occupation; except, if you start work at a reasonable occupation you will no longer be deemed disabled.

After the first 30 months of a certified period of disability:

You are not able, solely because of disease or injury, to work at any reasonable occupation.

- 12. The Plan also provides for a maximum benefit period to the participant's age 65.
- 13. Plaintiff ceased work on August 2, 1999, as a result of multiple physical symptoms he experienced which prevented him from performing the important duties of his own occupation on a full-time or part-time basis, or the duties of any occupation for which he is, or may reasonably become, suited by education, training, or experience. Mr. McBride suffered a

stroke on August 2, 1999.

- 14. Subsequent to his disability onset in 1999, Plaintiff applied for long term disability benefits under the LTD Plan by submitting a completed claim, including his Attending Physician's Statement, to Defendant.
- 15. Plaintiff's claim was approved on January 29, 2000, following the 180-day elimination period.
- 16. Plaintiff resumed work on a part-time basis (12 hours per week) later in 2000, but was unable to remain working after 7 weeks of employment.
- 17. Plaintiff received notification dated April 18, 2001, that he was approved for Social Security Disability benefits.
- 18. From the time of the onset of his disability, the Plaintiff was paid disability benefits. However, by letter dated June 8, 2001, AETNA informed Plaintiff that his continuing claim for LTD benefits was denied. The letter stated in pertinent part that "Aetna cannot certify your disability because we have not received medical information to show that you remain disabled."
- 19. By letter dated November 14, 2001, Aetna informed Plaintiff that information faxed by Plaintiff on October 25, 2001 would not be considered because it was received past the 60-day period given to appeal their decision, and Aetna upheld its prior denial.
- 20. By letter dated January 15, 2003, through his attorney, Plaintiff requested that his file remain open for review and appeal of Aetna's final decision.

- 21. By letter dated March 20, 2003, Aetna informed Plaintiff that their prior denial had been overturned and Plaintiff's disability benefits were restored, and brought current.
- 22. However, by letter dated August 1, 2003, Aetna informed Plaintiff that his Claim was yet again denied. The letter stated in pertinent part that "Aetna cannot certify your disability because we have not received medical information to show that you remain disabled."
 - 23. There had been no improvement in Plaintiff's condition as of August 1, 2003.
- 24. After filing a timely appeal, Plaintiff received notice of receipt of appeal dated January 14, 2004, and subsequently received a final letter of denial of benefits dated March 31, 2004.
 - 25. ERISA mandates, in relevant part:

[E]very employee benefit plan shall-

afford a reasonable opportunity to any participant whose claim for benefits has been denied a full and fair review by the appropriate named fiduciary of the decision denying the claim.

ERISA § 503(2); 29 U.S.C. § 1133(2).

- 26. The regulations, promulgated to ensure the protections afforded by ERISA § 503 to participants of employee benefit plans, further provide that every plan's benefit denial review procedure provide for a review of pertinent documents by the participant. *See* 29 CFR § 2560.503-1(g)(1)(ii).
- 27. Plaintiff has remained Totally Disabled in accordance with the terms and conditions of the LTD Plan, from August 1, 2003, when he was last paid under the Plan, until the date of the filing of this action.

AS AND FOR PLAINTIFF'S CLAIM: FOR LONG TERM DISABILITY BENEFITS

- 28. Plaintiff hereby incorporates by reference the allegations of paragraphs 1 27, *supra*, as if fully set forth at length.
- 29. Fiduciaries have a statutory obligation, in performing their duties, to act prudently and solely in the interest of plan participants and beneficiaries.
- 30. Plaintiff has not been provided with a full and fair review of his claim for benefits under the terms and conditions of the Plan, and in accordance with the provisions of ERISA.
- 31. The Long Term Disability claim decisions rendered in the instant action have been made by defendant, AETNA, the insurer of benefits under the terms of the Plan, which as such, cannot render independent or fair decisions because it has a pecuniary interest in the final determination, and thus acts under a conflict of interest.
- 32. Fiduciaries also have a statutory duty to fairly interpret and construe the terms of the Plan and thereby make decisions in accordance with Plan language.
- 33. Defendant's decisions were not supported by the medical evidence and moreover, did not correctly apply the language of the Plan.
- 34. Defendant's decisions in the instant claim were unreasonable, arbitrary and capricious and not supported by the evidence submitted with Plaintiff's claim, or the evidence submitted during the review stages of Plaintiff's claim.
 - 35. Plaintiff is disabled within the terms of the subject LTD Plan. Plaintiff is entitled

to the receipt of monthly Long Term Disability benefits pertaining to his disability from (and including) August 2, 1999, and continuing for the time allowed under the LTD Plan.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays for the following relief:

- A. That the Court determine and then declare that under the terms of the Plan, that the Plaintiff's total disability continued from (and included) August 1, 2003, within the term of coverage, and that he was and continues to be disabled within the Plan's provisions.
- B. That after making such a determination, the Court ORDER the defendant, AETNA, to provide all disability benefits to which Plaintiff is entitled under the terms and provisions of said Plan.
- C. That the Court award Plaintiff his attorney's fees pursuant to 29 U.S.C. §1132(g), as well as interest, costs, and disbursements.
- D. That the Court award Plaintiff such further, necessary, or proper relief as it deems just and equitable in the circumstances.

Dated: Haverhill, MA May 26, 2005

> PLAINTIFF By his attorney,

LAW OFFICE OF STEPHEN L. RAYMOND:

By:

Stephen L. Raymond 3 Washington Square, Ste. 206 Haverhill, MA 01830 (978) 372-6590 BBO #567753 JS 44 (Rev. 12/96)

CIVIL COVER SHEET

The JS-44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use

i. (a) PLAINTIFFS	purpose or inicating the	CIVII GOCKEL SCIENT.	NSTRUCTIONS ON THE REVERSE OF THE FORM.) DEFENDANTS									
LUTHER McBRII	DE		AETNA LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY									
(b) COUNTY OF RESIDENCE C	OF FIRST LISTED PLAINTIFF T IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CAS	SES)	COUNTY OF RESIDENCE OF FIRST LISTED DEFENDANT (IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY) NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE TRACT OF LAND INVOLVED.									
	of Stephen L. Raym on Square, Ste. 206 A 01830	ond, Esq.		AT CONEY (MICHOWN)	1113	1 NMG						
II. BASIS OF JURISDI	CTION (PLACE AN 1)	X" IN ONE BOX ONLY)		or Diversity Cases Only)		LACE AN "X" IN ONE BOX FOR PLAINTIFF NO ONE BOX FOR DEFENDANT) PTF DEF						
□ 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff	Y ³ Federal Question (U.S. Governme	nt Not a Party)	С	itizen of This State	of Business	or Principal Place 🛛 4 🖂 4 s In This State						
□ z U.S. Government Defendant					Citizen of Another State 2 2 Incorporated and Principal Place 5 5 6 Business In Another State Citizen or Subject of a 3 3 3 Foreign Nation 6 6							
W ODION		(DI ACE AA	L "Y" IN I	Foreign Country ONE BOX ONLY)		Appeal to District						
		,	Reinstat Reopen	Transferre		Judge from ict 📋 7 Magistrate						
V. NATURE OF SUIT	(PLACE AN "X" IN ON	E BOX ONLY)										
CONTRACT	ТО	RTS		FORFEITURE/PENALTY	BANKRUPTCY	OTHER STATUTES						
☐ 110 Insurance ☐ 120 Marine ☐ 130 Miller Act ☐ 140 Negotiable Instrument ☐ 150 Recovery of Overpayment	Overpayment into d'udgment is 1 320 Assault. Libel & Product Liability Stander 368 Asbestos Person 1940 Product Liability 368 Asbestos Person 1940 Product Liability 1940 Marine PERSONAL PROPER			□ 610 Agriculture □ 620 Other Food & Drug □ 625 Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 881 □ 630 Liquor Laws □ 640 R R & Truck □ 650 Arriline Regs □ 660 Occupational Safety:Health □ 690 Other	422 Appeal 28 USC 158 423 Withdrawal 28 USC 157 PROPERTY RIGHTS 820 Copyrights 830 Patent 840 Tracemark	400 State Reapportforment 410 Antitrust 450 Banks and Banking 450 Commerce/ICC Rates/etc 440 Deportation 470 Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations 810 Selective Service 850 Securities/Commodities						
153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits 160 Stockholders Suits 190 Other Contract 195 Contract Product Liability REAL PROPERTY	Liability □ 356 Motor Vehicle □ 355 Motor Vehicle Product Liabilit, □ 366 Other fersonal injury CIVIL RIGHTS	□ 371 Truth in Lendir □ 380 Other Persona Property Dam. □ 385 Property Dam. Product Liabits PRISONER PETI	age .	LABOR 710 Fau Labor Standards Act 720 Labor Mgntt Relations	SOCIAL SECURITY 861 HA 1395H 862 Black Lung 1923 863 DIWC DIWW (405rg) 864 SSID Trile XV	_ out chargy / modulion has						
210 Land Condemnation 220 Foreclosure 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment 240 Torts to Land 245 Tort Product Liability 250 All Other Real Property	□ 441 Voting □ 442 Employment □ 443 Housing/ Accommodations □ 444 Welfare □ 440 Other Civil Rights	☐ 510 Motions to Vac Sentence HABEAS CORPUS ☐ 530 General ☐ 535 Death Penatly ☐ 540 Mandamus & ☐ 550 Civil Rights ☐ 555 Prison Condit	cate Sther	☐ 730 Labor Mgm: Reporting & Disclosure Act ☐ 740 Railway Labor Act ☐ 790 Other Labor Litigation X 791 Empl Ret Inc Security Act	865 RSI 405(g): FEDERAL TAX SUITS 870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff or Defendant) 871 IRS - Third Party 25 USC 7609	950 Constitutionality of						
VI. CAUSE OF ACTIO	N (CITE THE U.S. CIVIL STAT			ING AND WRITE BRIEF STATEME	NT OF CAUSE.							
Suit for disa	ability benefits u	nder ERISA	§ 50	2(a)(1)(B), 29 U.	S.C. § 1132(a)(1)(B).						
VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:	CHECK IF THIS IS	S A CLASS ACT I	ON	DEMAND \$ CHECK YES only if demanded in complain JURY DEMAND: YES NO								
VIII.RELATED CASE(S) (See instructions): Ju	JDGE			DOCKET NUMBER							
DATE May 26, 2005		SIGNATURE OF	ATTORN	Stephen I	Raymond Esa							
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY		7		Stephen L.	Raymond, Esq.							
RECEIDT #	ARACH INIT	APPLYING IFP		JUDGE	MAG	II IDGE						

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS

1.	TITLE LUTI	OF CAS	e (name oi Bride v. A	FIRST PAI	RTY ON EA	ACH S	COMP	7 5	5	1	1		3		N	MG
2.	CATE	GORY IN	WHICH TH	E CASE BE	LONGS BA	SED U	U PON TI	HE NUN	ibere	D NAT	ure o	F SUIT	CODE	LIST	ED ON	THE
	CTVIL COVER SHEET. (SEE LOCAL RULE 40.1(A)(1)).															
		ľ.	160, 410,	470, R.23, R	EGARDLE	SS OF	NATUE	RE OF S	UIT.							
	X	X II. 195, 368, 400, 440, 441-444, 540, 550, 555, 625, 710, 720, 730, 740, 790, 791, 820°, 830°, 840°, 850, 890, 892-894, 895, 950. *Also complete AO 120 or AO 121 for patent, trademark or copyright cases														
	III. 110, 120, 130, 140, 151, 190, 210, 230, 240, 245, 290, 310, 315, 320, 330, 340, 345, 350, 355, 360, 362, 365, 370, 371, 380, 385, 450, 891.															
	_	rv.		423, 430, 4 6 0 861-865, 870			20, 630,	640 , 6 50	, 66 0,							
		v.	150, 152,	153.												
3.		and nui n/a	MBER, IF A!	NY, OF REL	ATED CAS	SES. (S	SEE LO	CAL RU	LE 40.	1(E)).				-		
4	HAS A		CTION BET	WEEN THE	SAME PAI	RTIES	AND B	ASED O	N THI	E SAMI	CLAI YES	M EVE		N FIL	ED IN	THIS
5.	DOES T	HE COM	IPLAINT IN	THIS CASE	QUESTIO	N THE	E CONST	TITUTIO	DNALI	TY OF	AN AC	T OF C	CONGI	RESS A	AFFECT	TING THE
			ST? (SEE .S.A. OR AN		-	FMPI	LOVEE	חק דעו	riie .	A PADI	YES			NO	X	
	50, .		LAG ON AL	Of Field	ioza oa	Livit	CO I EE	V. 1111	D 0.3. 7		YES			NO		
6.	IS THIS	CASE R	EQUIRED T	O BE HEAR	D AND DE	TERM	IINED B	Y A DIS	STRIC	r cou	RT OF	THREE	E JUDO	ES PI	URSUA	NT TO
	TITLE 2	28 USC 2	2847								YES			NO	×	
7.	DO ALL	PARTIE	S IN THIS A	CTION RES	SIDE IN TH	HE CE!	NTRAL	SECTIO	ON OF	THE D	ISTRIC	T OF!	MASSA	CHUS	SETTS	
			OUNTY) - (S				Th: #**	ADDEN	OD V	. samor	YES			NO	囟	
			itern sect (Le 40.1(D)).	ION (BEKK	SHIKE FR	VIVE	AN, RA	MFDEM	UK IL	<u>tmrsn</u>	YES			NO	X	
8.	DO ALI	OF THE	e parties f	ESIDING I	N MASSAC	HUSE	TTS RE	SIDE IN	THE	CENTR	AL AN	D/OR	WESTI	ERN S	ectio	NS OF
	THE DI	STRICT? IF YES	, in which	SECTION I	OOES THE	PLAI	NTIFY R	ESIDE:	·		YES			NO	DX.	
9.	IN WHI	CH SECT	нт од иоп	E ONLY PA	RTIES RE	SIDIN	G IN M	ASSACI	IUSET	TS RES	SIDE?_	E	aster	n		
10.	IF ANY AGENC	OF THE Y OF TH	PARTIES A E U.S.A. OR	RE THE UN	TTED STAT	T ES , C	OMMO O ALL	NWEAL OTHER	TH O	F Mass	SACHU ESIDE 1	SETTS IN THE	, OR A	NY G	over	NMENTAL
			ION; YES				OR WE							NO		
(PLI	EASE TY	PE OR P	RINT)													
		S NAME	-	Stepher	L. Ray	mon	nd, Es	q							_	
ADI	RESS_		3 Wash	ington S	guare. S	Ste.	206. I	laver	hill.	MA (0183	0			_	
		E NO.		78) 372	•										-	

(Categirm.rev - 3/97)